



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,195	03/06/2001	Suk H. Cho	09143-017001	3370

26191 7590 02/03/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
3300 DAIN RASCHER PLAZA
60 SOUTH SIXTH STREET
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

EVANS, CHARESSE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1615

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/800,195	CHO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Charesse L. Evans	1615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-30 and 32-34 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 31 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-30 and 32-34 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 7 & 8.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Action Summary

Acknowledgement is made of the receipt of applicant's response, amendments and remarks, filed November 13, 2002.

Acknowledgement is made of the cancellation of claim 31.

The rejection of record under 102(b) over Perkes (WO 99/07400) is withdrawn.

Claims 1-30 and 32-34 are pending in this action.

Response to Arguments

The rejection of record of claims 1-34 under 35 USC 103(a) over Perkes (WO 99/07400) is maintained. The rejection of record of claims 1-13, 16-19 and 21-32 under 35 USC 103(a) over Gaynor et al (US 5,904,924) is maintained. Applicant's arguments filed November 13, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the cited Perkes and Gaynor references do not teach or suggest any composition containing a grape skin extract in combination with a *Muscat* variety grape seed extract. However, applicant has not provided comparisons related to the results obtained by using that particularly claimed variety of grape seed.

What are the unexpected results one would derive by utilizing the Muscat grape seed extract? It is the position of the examiner that the Muscat limitation could be routinely determined by one of ordinary skill in the art, through minimal experimentation, as being suitable, absent the presentation of some unusual and/ or unexpected results. The results must be those that accrue from the specific limitations. It is suggested that applicant demonstrate, via a side-by-side comparison, the results obtained when using the grape seed extract of the cited reference and those results obtained by utilizing the claimed Muscat grape seed extract.

Applicant also argues that the Perkes and Gaynor references fail to disclose a composition where the ratio of grape skin extract to grape seed extract is between 3 to 1 and 5 to 1. Applicant posits that the Gaynor reference represents a ratio of grape skin extract to grape seed extract of 7.5 to 1. A ratio of 7.5 to 1 is within the same range as the ratio of 5 to 1, such that the ratios practically overlap. Applicants can rebut a *prima facie* case of obviousness based on overlapping ranges by showing the criticality of the claimed ranges. “The law is replete with cases in which the difference between the claimed invention and the prior art is some range or other variable within the claims....In such a situation, the applicant must show that the particular range is critical, generally by showing that the claimed range achieves unexpected results relative to the prior art range.” *In re Woodruff*, 919 F.2d 1575, 16 USPQ2d 1934 (Fed. Cir. 1990). To establish unexpected results over a claimed range, applicants

should compare a sufficient number of tests both inside and outside the claimed range to show the criticality of the claimed range. *In re Hill*, 284 F.2d 955, 128 USPQ 197 (CCPA 1960).

Regarding the argument that the Gaynor reference does not teach or suggest a grape skin extract and grape seed extract containing the recited amounts of the particular flavanols, when a component is included in a composition, all of its properties and advantages are inherent to the composition.

This rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action

is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charesse L. Evans whose telephone number is 703-308-6400. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday 7:00a - 4:30p; Alternating Fridays 7:00a - 3:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thurman K. Page can be reached on 703-308-2927. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1235.

Charesse L. Evans
January 29, 2003

THURMAN K. PAGE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600
TKP